stocere and earnest prayer for re followed them from the lips of been personally engaged in the that "expelled" them "from

leisure for preparation for their long, uncertain journey," &c. The first campaign against them closed with an agreement with them against them closed with an agreement with them that they would leave the State as soon as the opening of the next spring would permit; "as soon as the grass grew;" and a small military force was left on the ground, to secure peace to both parties. But the spring came, and the summer was passing, and their agreement was not fulfilled; and if "square miles of ripened grain were abandoned," it was when the inhabitants of the county believed they did not intend to leave

Their city was left to the care of a commi of their own responsible men, to dispose of a real estate they had been forced to abandand that committee should deem most proper they remained months after the "Ex"

their people.

And now let it be submitted to the laim to And now let it be submitted to be saim to of a candid public, whether they he of "the the style, in the words of our friguision, in modern Israel," and whether theiords again, its moral bearings, would, in hias cruel and contain the record of a persecue Huguenots

from France" that as inhabit. Gilmore of Pa. He indeed frankly args of tibeir rolley thus Gormer of Indiana ants of the Territory of Ut of placery. And I furian of Indiana. far has been to blink the suwill not be likely to again: "Toleration of slaheir claim as Saints facilitate the recognitione may well question of the Latter Day." heen the policy of the whether such would be hose best acquainted persecuted Huguenscople, would not expect, with the Mormons, or morals; and the Union with the Mormons, or morats, and the chose in them, a decisive from that Territory, unless may well fear tronsit from Illinois to Utah, Managonism, in sated. Had our friend only has become realte opinions of that people, expressed hisade on the fair name of an inand thrown sed community, the foregoing de-jured and c have been needed; but doubtless fence woulice to all; and a fair investigation he desirey of that people would correct many of the hof them, and of others.

false vi, for truth and justice, County, Illinois, August 31, 1850.

HE NATIONAL ERA.

WASHINGTON, SEPTEMBER 26, 1850.

The "A BARNBURNER" shall be heard nex

who have sent us books, &c., will excuse us this week. Next week their favors shall be noticed.

TT "Sketches of our Village," by Martha Russell, are attracting deservedly much notice. We are glad to hear that they will probably be published in a more permanent form.

A CORRECTION.

It will be recollected that last week, in explaining the votes on the Texas Boundary Bill and amendments, we showed that their opponents were in favor of committing to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, while their friends were anxious to put them through at once by the power of the previous question, which gags debate and cuts off all amendments In stating, (3d column, 3d page, of last week's Era,) the second vote on committing, we said-

"Let us see who were in favor of this gag policy those who voted for it were," &c. Then follow the names of those who were in favor of com mitting, and of course against the gag policy. The introductory sentence therefore should have been-" Let us see who were in favor of committing, and against this policy: those who were in favor of committing, were," &c.

The majority of our readers doubtless so understood it, but some may have misapprehended The article was very long, required a very laborious analysis and comparison of votes, and was prepared amidst great pressure of business, so that occasionally it was more obscure than it we may may more time to be

To the Editor of the National Era :

Sin: In your account of the proceedings of the House upon the Texan boundary bill, you have my name recorded as voting in the negative, on the motion of Mr. Wentworth to commit the bill. with instructions to insert a clause restricting slavery in New Mexico. The recording of my name in the negative, on that vote, was a mistake, which was corrected on the reading of the Journal next morning. I have never voted against the Wilmot Proviso, but on all suitable apportunities have Louis FREEDLEY House of Representatives, September 23, 1850.

We saw the vote, but not the correction. We thank Mr. Freedley for calling our attention to

the matter .- Ed. Eva.

THE CALIFORNIA BILL - THE VOTES.

We conclude to-day the record of the action of Congress upon the measures recommended originally by the Compromise Committee of the Sen-

Saturday, September 7th, the bill for the admis sion of California was taken from the Speaker's table, and read twice by its title. Mr. Boyd of Kentucky (as usual) was recognised by the Chair, and proposed an amendment providing for the establishment of a Territorial Government for Utah. Mr. Vinton objected that the amendment was out of order, not being germane to the bill. The Speaker said the decision made by himself when the Texan Boundary bill was under discussion covered the point of order raised by Mr Vinton; therefore he ruled the amendment in order. It will be recollected that, when the Speaker decided that the amendment of Mr. Boyd, incorporating the bill for the establishment of Ter ritorial Government in New Mexico and Utah with the Texan Boundary bill, was in order, he was sustained on an appeal, by a vote of 129 to 83. His decision that the amendment, adding the Utah Territorial bill to the bill for the admission of California, was in order, was identical in principle with the former one, and had the House been consistent, it would have been sustained. That it was an erroneous decision, every intelligent and candid mind must, it seems to us, acknowledge. But, in the former case, the majority was in favor of a combination of measures. in the latter, against it, so that the vote in both cases was controlled by a determination to effect a certain purpose. The decision of the Speaker was sustained in the former case by a vote of 129 to 83, or a majority of 46; and reversed in the latter by a vote of 115 to 87, or a majority of 28 !

Mr. Thompson of Mississippi obtained the floor, and moved a substitute for the bill, proposing to organize the State of California north of 360 30', and form a Territory south of that line. He at the same time accepted and moved an amendment to the bill, providing that the south- hereafter should oppose the admission of any more ern boundary of said State be established on the

parallel of 360 30' north latitude. Mr. Richardson of Illinois demanded the previous question, and the Speaker explained that if it were seconded, the House would be brought to a vote first upon the amendment, then the substitute, and finally upon ordering the bill to a third reading. Motions were made to adjourn, on the former bills, there was a similar difference yens and nays asked, but the House resolved to in favor of the liberality of the Southern Whigs. proceed to a decision. The previous question was seconded, and the question being put on Mr. Thompson's amendment, it was rejectedyeas 75, nays 132-all the year being from the South, all the ways from the North, except Gentry and Williams of Tennessee, Haymond of have throughout the session displayed a most in- decide on the question of admitting Utah as a Virginia, Houston of Delaware, Kerr of Mary- tolerant, sectional spirit. land, Phelps of Missouri, Stanly of North Caro-

lina-six Whigs, one Democrat. Mr. Thompson's substitute was then rejected-

The question recurred on ordering the bill to a | Clingman!

of excitement. And we need third reading. Mr Hames of South Carolina moved an adjournment, and asked the yeas and nays—only ten voted for them, and the House refused to advurn. The bill was then ordered to a third eading-yeas 157, nays 51. The cle asserts that "the wretched exiles previous outline was demanded on the passage of the bil' Mr. Featherston of Mississippi moved to lay jupon the table, and called for the year and v's, but they were not ordered; and his motion as rejected. Under the operation of the prous question the bill was then passed-year

nays 56.

Cable of Ohio

Carter, Ohio

FOR THE BILL.

An analysis presents the following results: Northern Democrat Manu of Pennsylvania Albertson of Indiana Bingham of Michigan. McClernand of Illinois McDonald of Indiana. Rissell, Illinois. Booth* of Connecticut. McLanahan of Pa. Morris of Ohio. Brown of Indiana Olds of Ohio. Peaslee of N. H. Peck of Vermo Potter of Ohio Dimmick of Pa Disney of Ohio. Richardson of Illinois Doty of Wisconsin. Robbins of Pa. Robinson of Indiana Dunham of Indiana Ross of Pennsylvania Durkee* of Wis. Sawtelle of Maine. Fitch of Indiana. Stetson of Maine Fuller of Main Sweetser of Ohio. Thomason of Pa. Waldo of Connecticut Hibbard of N. H Wentworth of Illinois Whittlesey of Ohio. Wildrick of N. J. Hoagland of Ohio P. King* of New York

Littlefield of Maine Southern Democrats Johnson of Tennessee Jones of Tennessee. Bay of Missouri. Rowlin of Missouri Mason of Kentucky Ewing of Tenn. McLane of Maryland. Hall of Missouri Phelps of Missouri-1 Hamilton of Maryland

Young of Illinois-49

Whies King of Rhode Island Alexander of N. Y. King of New Jersey. J. A. King of N. Y Andrews of New York Levin (N. A.) of Pa. Mann of Mass. Baker of Illinois Bennett of New York. Matteson of New York Bokee of New York. Briggs of New York. McGaughey of Indiana McKissock of N. Y. Meacham of Vermont Burrows of New York. atler of Pennsylvania Moore of Penn Nelson of New York. Butler of Connecticut Newell of N. J. Calvin of Pennsylvania. Campbell of Ohio Ogle of Pennsylvania Casey of Pennsylvania. Phoenix of New York. Chandler of Pa. Clark of New York. Pitman of Pennsylvania Putnam of New York. Reed of Pennsylvania. Cole of Wisconsin. Corwin of Ohio. Reynolds of New York Root* of Ohio. Crowell of Ohio Dickey of Pa. Rose of New York. Dixon of R. I. Duer of New York. Rumsey of New York. Sackett of New York. Duncan of Mass. Eliot of Mass. Schenck of Ohio Schoolcraft of N. Y Evans of Ohio Schermerhorn of N. Y. Silvester of New York. Fowler of Mass Freedley of Penn Sprague of Michigan. Giddings of Ohio Gott of New York. Stevens of Pa. Taylor of Ohio Gould of New York Grinnell of Mass. Thurman of N. Y Halloway of New York. Tuck of N. H. Underhill of New York Henry of Vermont. Howe of Pa. Van Dyke of N. J. Hunter of Ohio Vinton of Ohio.

Wilson of N. H .- 74 Whigs. Anderson of Tennessee. Marshall of Kentucky McLean of Kentucky Bowie of Md. Breck of Kentucky Morehead of Kentucky Caldwell of N Carolina Stanly of N. Carolina Thompson of Kentucky. Watkins of Tennessee. Evans of Maryland. Gentry of Tennessee Williams of Tenn. Haymond of Virginia. Johnson of Kentucky Houston of Del.-17. Kerr of Maryland

Jackson of New York.

Those marked thus * are free-soilers AGAINST THE BILL

White of New York.

Southern Democrats Ashe of N. Carolina. Johnson of Arkansas Averett of Virginia. Kaufman of Texas. Bayly of Virginia McDowell of Virginia Beale of Virginia. McMullen of Virginia. Boyd of Kentucky McQueen of S. C. Borr of South Carolina Meade of Virginia Millson of Virginia Caldwell of Kentucky. Morse of Louisiana Colcock of S. C. Edmundson of Va Featherston of Miss Green of Missouri Haralson of Georgia Harris of Alabama. Holladay of Virginia Howard of Texas Hubbard of Alabams Inge of Alabama.

Orr of South Carolin Parker of Virginia. Powell of Virginia Savage of Tennesses Seddon of Virginia. Stanton of Tennessee Thomas of Tennesse Thompson of Miss. Venable of N. C. Wallace of S. C. Wellborn of Georgia. Jackson of Georgia Woodward of S. C .- 46 Southern Whire Morton of Virginia.

Outlaw of N. Carolina

Alston of Alabama Deberry of N. Carolina. Hilliard of Alabama.

Owen of Georgia. Shepperd of N. C. Toombs of Georgia Sectionally we have the following view Northern or Free States. Maine New Hampshire Vermont Rhode Island

New York 31 New Jersey 4 Pennsylvania 21 Ohio 19 Indiana 10 Illimois 7 Michigan 3 Wisconsin 3 Iowa 1	0 0 0 0 0 0 0
Pennsylvania 21 Ohio 19 Indiana 10 Illinois 7 Michigan 3 Wisconsin 3	0 0 0 0 0
Ohio 19 Indiana 10 Illinois 7 Michigan 3 Wisconsin 3	0 0 0 0
Indiana	0 0 0
Illinois 7 Michigan 3 Wisconsin 3	0 0
Michigan	0
Wisconsin 3	0
Wisconsin	
lowa 1	0
	1000
Total 123	.0
Southern or Slaveholding States.	
Yeas.	Nays
Delaware 1	.0
Maryland 5	0
Virginia 1	13
North Carolina 2	5
South Carolina 0	7
Georgia 0	4
Florida 0	1
Alabama 0	7
Louisiana 0	8
Texas	2
Arkansas 0	1
Missouri 0	4
Tennessee 7	4
Kentucky 7	4
Missouri 4	1
_	-
Total 27	55
North. South.	Total
Yeas 123 27	150
Nays 0 55	55
	-
Majority	95

Two-thirds of the Southern members voted against the admission. Had the State been a slaveholding one, they would have voted for it. King, J. A. King, Mann of Massachusetts, Mat-Their opposition, therefore, rested upon the fact teson, McKissock, Meacham, Moore, Nelson, that it was a free State. Of course, they can- Newell, Ogle, Otis, Reed, Reynolds, Rumsey, not complain if Northern Members of Congresss | Sackett, Schenck, Schoolcraft, Silvester, Sprague

slave States. We hope the Democrats of the free States will not overlook another aspect of this vote. Seventeen Southern Whigs voted for the admission of the free State of California-only ten against it -while forty-six Southern Democrats voted against it and only ten for it! Indeed, in the votes

And yet, the Washington Union claims the settlement of this territorial question as the work of the National Democracy. The truth is, with some honorable exceptions in the House and Senate, the Democratic members from the South | this Congress cannot bind the Congress that shall

Georgia said California must not come into the Union. Mr. Clingman announced that the game of obstruction would be resorted to against her yeas 71, nays 134-all the yeas being from the The Southern Press laughed at the idea of admit-South, all the mays from the North, except Bowie ting her-such an act would overthrow the Union. and Kerr of Maryland, Bowlin, Hall and Phelps | What a comment upon all this, is the peaceful of Missouri, Gentry, Williams, and Watkins of admission of the new State, with an unmutilated Tennessee, Stanly of North Carolina, Haymond | boundary, by a vote of two to one-only ten men of Virginia, and Houston of Delaware—eight having been found in the House silly enough to attempt the game so solemnly threatened by Mr.

The Democrats of Massachusett and the Governor, and Henry Cushman for Lieutenant Governor, and Henry C

THE UTAH BILL.

Saturday, September 7, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union. Mr. Boyd, who seems to have been selected as the chief manager in the House of the Compromise measures from the Senate, was recognised by the Speaker, and he hoped by unanimous consent the Utah Bill might be taken up. The first section was read, as follows:

"Be it enacted, &c., &c., That all that part of the territory of the United States included within the following limits, to wit: bounded on the west by the State of California, on the north by the Territory of Oregon, and on the east by the summit of the Rocky Mountains, and on the south by the thirty-seventh parallel of north latitude, be and the same is hereby created into a temporary Government, by the name of the Ter-ritory of Utah; and when admitted as a State, the said Territory, or any portion of the same, shall be received into the Union, with or without slavery, as their Constitution may prescribe at the time of their admission: Provided, That nothing in this act admission: Provided, That nothing in this act contained shall be construed to inhibit the Gov-ernment of the United States from dividing said Territory into two or more Territories, in such manner and at such times as Congress shall deem convenient and proper, or from attaching any portion of said Territory to any other State or Cerritory of the United States

Mr Wentworth said there was one proviso in this bill, and he wished to move another, as fol-

That neither slavery nor involuntary servi tude, except for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist in any of the Territories acquired by the treaty of Guada-

lupe Hidalgo." He subsequently modified it so as to evade to point of order, as follows:

That neither slavery nor involuntary servi tude, except for crime whereof the party shall have been daly convicted, shall exist in the said

As the yeas and mays cannot be called in Committee, tellers are demanded, where it is desirable to hold members to some responsibility, but this is a poor substitute for the yeas and nays. The question on this amendment-the Wilmot Proviso-was taken by tellers, and decided in the negative-yeas 69, nays 78-only 147 members voting in a House of 230! The free States send 139 members, so that only a few more than half of them voted on the Proviso. Could the question have been taken in the House, by yeas and nays, the Proviso might have been defeated, but the vote in favor of it would have been much

We were not present on this vote, but we are informed that among the nays was General James Wilson of New Hampshire, who, after having been elected on the strength of his desperate professions of Free-Soilfsm, fulfilled his pledges on this memorable occasion by voting all the way through with the pro-slavery men. Since then, he has resigned his seat in Congress, and is an applicant, we understand, for the collectorship in California.

Mr. Seddon of Virginia moved :

"And that, prior to the formation of State Con stitutions, there shall be no prohibition by reason of any law or usage existing in said Territory, or by the action of the Territorial Legislature, of the emigration of all citizens of the United States with any kind of property recognised as such in any of the States of the Union." Rejected-yeas 55, nays 85.

Mr. Stevens of Pennsylvania moved : "And when admitted as a State, the said Ter-

ritory, or any portion of the same, shall be re-ceived into the Union, with or without slavery, is their Constitution may prescribe at the time o heir admission."

Rejected-yeas 58, nays 85. Mr. Fitch moved the following as an additional

proviso to the 1st section of the bill, viz " Provided, That the Mexican law prohibiting slavery be and remain in full force in said Terri-

Mr. Millson moved to amend the amendment of Mr. Fitch, by offering the following as a sub-

"Provided, That no law or usage existing in the said Territory, at or before the time when the same was acquired by the United States, shall be need to desay, a limiter within the tory, any rights of property of relations of per sons that may be now recognised and allowed in any of the United States."

Mr. Millson's amendment was rejected-yeas 49, nays 92; Mr. Fitch's amendment met with a similar fate, being also rejected-yeas 52, nays 85.

Mr. Wellborn of Georgia moved : "Provided further, That the people of said Ter-ritory be allowed to pass all laws necessary for the protection of slavery within said Territory, should slaves be introduced there." Mr. Seddon moved to amend the amendment

by adding the following: "And to remove all restrictions to the free em-

gration of persons with their property." Both amendments were rejected without a

Mr Schenck moved to amend by striking the following from the 9th section, viz: "Except only that in all cases involving title

to slaves, the said writs of error or appeals shall be allowed and decided by the said Supreme Court, without regard to the value of the matter, property, or title in controversy; and except,

Mr Schenck explained that he desired to get rid of the implication that slavery existed in the Territory. His amendment, however, was disagreed to, it being the manifest determination of the House to put the bill through precisely as it came from the Senate.

The Committee rose, reported the bill, which, under the operation of the previous question, was ordered to a third reading, and then passed-yeas 97, nays 85.

NORTHERN DEMOCRATS IN THE AFFIRMATIVE. Albertson, Bissell, W. J. Brown, Dimmick, Disney, Dunham, Fuller, Gerry, Gilmore, Gorman, Harris of Illinois, Hibbard, Hoagland, Leffler Littlefield, Mann of Pennsylvania, McClernand McDonald, McLanahan, Peaslee, Potter, Richardson, Robbins, Robinson, Ross, Strong, Thompson of Pennsylvania, Walden, Wildrick, and Young-30.

NORTHERN WHIGS IN THE AFFIRMATIVE-BO kee, Briggs, Brooks, Butler of Pennsylvania, Casey, Eliot, Levin, Pitman, Rose, Thurman, Wilson-11

Affirmative votes from the North, 41. DEMOCRATIC NAYS FROM THE NORTH .- Bing

ham, Booth, Cable, Doty, Fitch, Harlan, Preston King, Morris, Olds, Peck, Sawtelle, Stetson, Sweetser, Waldo, and Wentworth-15. WHIG NAYS FROM THE NORTH-Alexander.

Bennett, Burrows, Butler of Conn., Calvin, Campbell, Chandler, Clarke, Cole, Corwin, Crowell, Dickey, Dixon, Duer, Duncan, Evans of Ohio, Fowler, Gott, Gould, Halloway, Hebard, Henry, Hunter, Jackson of New York, G. G. King, J. G. Stevens of Pennsylvania, Taylor, Van Dyke, and

Vinton-18. FREE SOIL NAVS FROM THE NORTH-Allen Durkee, Giddings, Howe, Julian, Root, and Tuck-7

Total nays from the North, 70.

Fifteen nays were given by Southern members who were opposed to any settlement of the question at all.

So the Utah Bill, excluding the Wilmot Proviso, and providing that the People of the Territory, when they shall come to form a State Government, may allow or prohibit slavery just as they please, was passed. Of course, the act of State. That Congress will be bound by its own judgment alone. COAXING GEORGIA TO STAY IN THE UNION .- The

Washington Republic (Mr. Webster's echo) is coaxing Georgia, in a most winning style, to stay in the Union. There is imminent danger that Georgia will yield to the soft enticement. The Democrats of Massachusetts have nomina

THE FUGITIVE BILL.

Next week we shall publish this bill, as it finally passed Congress and received the sanction of the Executive. It disregards all the ordinary securities of personal liberty. It increases the facilities for the apprehension and surrender of fugitive slaves, by authorizing the appointment of as many commissioners as the Circuit Courts of the United States may choose to appoint, to decide in cases of claims for fugitives. No provision is made for jury trial, habeas corpus, or appeal; none for redress of injuries to the freeman who may be arrested and imprisoned, through mistake, carelessness, wantonness, or sinister purpose. Whether a man shall be consigned to perpetual bondage or not, is to be left to the sole decision of any person who may be designated as commissioner, acting without responsibility. In the free States, the office of a commissioner appointed solely for the purpose of securing the recapture and delivery of runaway slaves, will odious one, so odious, that it will be almost impostible to find any person of respectability to discharge its functions. The consequence will be, that men of disreputable character will be appointed, to whom the difference between five dollars-the fee allowed when the claim is decided against the state of the the segment of the claim is adjudged good-will be an important

to aid, if necessary, in the apprehension and delivery of fugitives; and the punishment for aiding in their escape, or for harboring them, is one thousand dollars, with imprisonment not exceeding six months, besides one thousand dollars, to be recovered in a suit for civil damages for each fugitive thus aided or harbored. We shall have more to say of it hereafter.

This bill having undergone discussion in the Senate, was finally passed and sent to the House, where September 12 it was taken up and forced through without discussion, consideration, or any opportunity for amendment.

The bill coming up, James Thompson of Penn sylvania was recognised by the Speaker, who, we suppose, understood the views of that gentleman. He addressed the House in support of the bill, and closed by moving the previous question. Mr. Stevens of Pennsylvania appealed to his colleague to withdraw the motion, as he desired to reply to him. Mr. Thompson would consent only on condition that Mr. Stevens would renew it, and this he refused to do. Other appeals were no more successful. Mr. Crowell moved a call of the House. Refused. The demand for the previous question was sustained-yeas 87, nays 69. Mr. Stevens moved to lay the bill on the table. Lostyeas 67, nays 113. The main question was ordered to be put, and the bill was ordered to a third reading-yeas 105, nays 73. The bill was read a third time by its title, and the question being, Shall it pass? Mr. Thompson moved a call of the House, which was decided in the negative-yeas 73, nays 100. The question, Shall this bill pass? was then decided in the affirmativeyeas 109, nays 75. The vote we find classified in the New York Evening Post, as follows:

Democrats.-Maine-Fuller, Gerry, Littlefield. N. Hampshire-Hibbard, Peaslee. New York—Walden. New Jersey—Wildrick. Pennsylva-nia—Dimmick, Mann, McLanahan, Robbins, Ross, Thompson Virginia—Averett, Bay, Bayly, Beale, McDonald, McMullen, Holliday, Meade Millson, Parker, Powell, Seddon. N. Carolina— Ashe, Caldwell, Venable. South Carolina—Burt Colcock, McQueen, Orr, Wallace, Holmes, Woodward. Georgia—Haralson, Jackson. Alabama— Bowdon, Cobb, Hubbard, Inge. Louisiana—La Bowdon, Cobb, Hubbard, Inge. Louisana—La Sère. Tennessee—Ewing, Harris, Johnson, Sav-age, Stanton, Thomas, Wellborn. Texas—How-ard, Kaufman. Mississippi—Brown, Feather-ston, McWillie, Thompson. Arkansas—John-son, Jones, Missouri—Bay, Bowlin, Green, Hall, Hamilton, Phelps. Kentucky—Boyd, Caldwell, Mason, Stanton. Ohio—Hongland, Miller. Michigan-Buel. Indiana-Albertson, Brown, Dunham. Gorham. Hli nand, Richardson, Young. Iowa-Leffler. California-Gilbert.

Whigs.-New Hampshire-Hibbard. Masse chusetts Eliot. Ohio Taylor. Virginia Haynood. Nins. Anna Carolina Clingman, Deberry,
Stanly. South Carolina—Outlaw. Georgia— Owen, Toombs. Alabama—Ashton, Hilliard. Tennessee—Anderson, Gentry, Watkins, Williams. Kentucky—Breck, Johnson, Marshall, McLean, Thompson. Indiana—McGaughey.

Democrats.-Maine-Sawtelle, Stetson. Connecticut—Booth, Waldo. Ohio—Cable, Carter, Disney, Morris, Whittlesey, Wood. Michigan— Bingham. Indiana—Fitch, Harlan, Robinson. ois-Wentworth. California-Wright. Whigs .- Maine - Otis. Vermont - Hebard.

Henry, Meacham. Massachusetts—Duncan, Fow-ler, Mann. Rhode Island—Dixon, King. Connecticut-Butler. New York-Alexander, Bur nett, Briggs, Burrows, Gott, Gould, Halloway, Jackson, John A. King, Matteson, McKissock, Nelson Putnam, Rumsey, Sackett, Schermerhorn Schoolcraft, Thurman, Underhill. New Jersey Hay, King, Silvester. Pennsylvania—Calvin, Chandler, Dickey, Freedley, Hampton, Moore, Pitman, Reed, Stevens. Ohio—Corwin, Evans, Vinton. Michigan—Sprague. Illinois—Baker.

Free-Soilers.—New Hampshire—Tuck. Massachusetts—Allen. New York—Preston King.

Pennsylvania—Howe. Ohio—Campbell, Crowell Giddings, Hunter, Root. Indiana—Julian. Wis-Yeas 109, nays 75.

ABSENT OR NOT VOTING Northern Whigs .- Andrews, Ashmun, Bokee Northern Wings.—Andrews, Ashmun, Bokee Brooks, Butler, Casey, Ciarke, Conger, Duer Goodenow, Grinnell, Levin, Nes, Newell, Ogle, Phœnix, Reynolds, Risley, Rockwell, Rose, Schenck, Spaulding, Yan Dyke, White—24.

Free-Soilers.—Wilmot—1.
Northern Democrats.—Cleveland, Gilmore, Olds. Peck. Potter, Strong, Sweetser, Thompson of Southern Whigs .- Cabell, Evans of Maryland, Morehead-3.

Southern Democrats.—Ashe, Averett, Bay, Bayly, Beale, Bocock, Hackett, Harmanson, Hammond, McDowell, McLane, Morse-12 Total absent or not voting-50.

Northern Democrats voting for the bill-27. Northern Whigs voting for the bill-4 : Hibhard of New Hampshire, Eliot of Massachusetts Taylor of Ohio, McGaughey of Indiana.

The members who intentionally absented themselves when this bill was about to be voted on. are less to be respected than those who boldly recorded their names in the affirmative. Mr. Stevens of Pennsylvania, after the passage of the bill, gravely rose, and suggested to the Chair the propriety of despatching one of the pages, to inform his Whig friends who had gone out, that they now sould return in safety, as the slavery matter was disposed of!

THE SLAVE TRADE BILL.

The bill to suppress the slave trade in the District of Columbia, which passed the House on the 17th inst., is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Resentatives of the United States of America in Con-gress assembled, That from and after the - day of — next, it shall not be lawful to bring into the District of Columbia any slave whatever, for the District of Columbia any slave whatever, for the purpose of being sold, or for the purpose of being placed in depot, to be subsequently trans-ferred to any other State or place to be sold as merchandise. And if any slave shall be brought into the said District by its owner, or by the authority or consent of its owner, contrary to the provisions of this act, such slave shall thereupon

secome liberated and free.
SEC. 2. And be it further enacted, That it shall Skc. 2. And be it further contest, That it shall and may be lawful for each of the corporations of the cities of Washington and Georgetown, from time to time, and as often as may be necessary, to abate, break up, and abolish any depot or place of confinement of slaves brought into the said District as merchandise, contrary to the prosaid District as merchandise, contrary to the pro-visions of this act, by such appropriate means as may appear to either of the said corporations ex-pedient and proper. And the same power is here-by vested in the levy court of Washington coun-ty, if any attempt shall be made within its juris-dictional limits to establish a depot or place of confinement for slaves brought into the District as merchandise for sale contrary to this act.²³

This bill does not touch the relation of slavery as it exists in the District-it does not prevent the sale of slaves to be transported out of the District-it simply prohibits the importation of slaves as merchandise into our territory, and authorizes the corporations of Washington and Georgetown to break up depots of slaves so im-

one, in the right direction.

But even this small concession to the spirit of he age was grudgingly yielded by the slaveholding members of Congress. They attempted at first to encumber it with a vindictive provision, making the act of inducing or aiding slaves in the Disto escape, a felony, punishable with fine, and imprisonment in the penitentiary not more than ten or less than five years; and failing in this, they generally voted against the bill.

In the Senate, September 14, the bill having een reported from the Committee of the Whole with amendments, was taken up. The amendnents as subsequently modified were as follows

"Sec. 3. And be it further enacted. That if any free person or persons, within the District of Columbia, shall entice, or induce, or attempt, by persuasion or other means, to entice or induce any slave or slaves to run away from his, her, or their owner or lawful possessor, or shall in any manner aid, abet, or assist any slave or slaves in running away or escaping from the owner or law-ful possessor of such slave or slaves, or shall harbor any slave or slaves with the intent to assist him, her, or them, to escape from the service of such owner or possessor, such person or persons shall be liable to indictment in the criminal court of the District of Columbia; and upon conviction, by verdict, confession, or otherwise, shall be imprisoned in the penitentiary not exceeding five

"Sec. 4. And be it further enacted, That in case harbored with the intent to assist him, her, or them, in running away or escaping from service, shall actually run away and escape from the sershall actually run away and escape from the ser-vice of the lawful owner or owners, any person convicted as aforesaid of such enticing, persua-ding, assisting, or harboring, shall also be sen-tenced by the said court to pay to the owner or owners of said slave of slaves the value of the same, to be assessed and determined by the said court, to be recovered by execution, as in cases of other judgments.

"SEC. 5. And be it further enacted, That the said corporations and the said levy court, respectively, shall be, and they are hereby, invested with the power, by police regulations not inconsistent with the laws and Constitution of the United States, to prohibit the coming of free negroes to reside within their respetive jurisdictional limits, and to remove therefrom such as may come with-in these limits contrary to such prohibition, and to regulate the behaviour of those now residing or who may hereafter be allowed to reside in the same; and to enforce such removal, or a compliance with such regulation, by a fine not exceed-ing two hundred dollars, and imprisonment at laor for a time not exceeding six months, or either, at their discretion." The question was taken on concurring in each

section separately. The 3d section was rejected as follows :

YEAS-Messrs. Badger, Barnwell, Bell, Berrien, Butler, Davis of Mississippi, Dawson, Dick-inson, Downs, Foote, Hunter, King, Mason, Mor-ton, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Soulé, Sturgeon, Turney, Underwood, and Yulee-22

NAYS—Messrs. Baldwin, Benton, Bright, Chase, Clarke, Clay, Davis of Massachusetts, Dayton, Dodge of Wisconsin, Dodge of Iowa, Ewing, Felch, Fremont, Greene, Gwin, Hale, Hamlin, Jones, Norris, Seward, Shields, Smith, Spruance, Wales, Walker, and Winthrop—26.

Dickinson and Sturgeon were the only Northern Senators voting in the affirmative. Benton. Clay, Spruance, and Wales, from slave States, voted in the negative. Fremont and Gwin, it will be observed, voted with the North. General Cass absented himself.

The 4th section being dependent upon the 3d was rejected without a division A motion made by Mr. Davis of Mississippi to

postpone further proceedings till Monday, failed-yeas 18, nays 31. The question was taken on concurring with

the 5th section, and decided in the negative as follows

Yeas—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Barnwell, Bell, Berrien, Butler, Davis of Mississippi, Daw-son, Dickinson, Downs, Hunter, King, Mason, Morton, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Soulé, and Tur-NAYS - Messrs. Baldwin, Benton, Bright, Chase, Clarke, Clay, Davis of Massachusetts, Dayton, Dodge of Wisconsin, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Ewing, Felch, Fremont, Green, Gwin, Hale, Hamlin, Jones, Norris, Seward, Shields,

Smith, Sprusnoe, Sturgeon, Underwood, Dickinson, the only Northern man voting in the affirmative; Benton, Clay, Underwood, Spruance, and Wales, from slave States, voting nay, General Cass absented himself.

The bill was then ordered to be engressed for a third reading by the following vote:

YEAS-Messrs. Baldwin, Benton, Bright, Cass, Chase, Clarke, Clay, Davis of Massachusetts, Dayton, Dickinson, Dodge of Wisconsin, Dodge Of Iowa, Douglas, Ewing, Felch, Fremont, Greene, Gwin, Hale, Hamlin, Jones, Norris, Seward, Shields, Smith, Spruance, Sturgeon, Underwood, Wales, Walker, Whitcomb, and Winthrop—32. NAYS—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Barnwell, Bell, Berrien, Butler, Davis of Mississippi, Daw-son, Downs, Hunter, King, Mason, Morton, Pratt,

Rusk, Sebastian, Soulé, Turney, and Yulee-19 Benton, Clay, Underwood, Spruance, and Wales, were the only Southern Senators who voted in the affirmative. General Cass, who had dodged on the amendments, could safely venture vote on the bill itself. The reporters and letter-writers were greatly amused at the good luck of the General in always finding business out of the Senate just when a vote would have been inconvenient.

The bill was taken up Monday following, and

passed by the following vote: YEAS-Messrs. Baldwin, Benton, Bright, Cass, Chase, Clarke, Clay, Cooper, Davis of Massachusetts, Dayton, Dickinson Dodge of Wisconsin, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Ewing, Felch, Fremont, Greene, Gwin, Hale, Hamlin, Houston, Jones, Norris, Seward, Shields, Spruance, Sturgeon, Underwood, Wales, Walker, Whitcomb, and

Winthrop—33.

Nays—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Barnwell, Bell, Berrien, Butler, Davis of Mississippi, Dawson, Downs, Hunter, King, Mangum, Mason, Morton, Pratt, Sebastian, Soulé, Turney, and

The absentees from the South were, Pearce of Maryland, Clemens of Alabama, Foote of Mississippi, Rusk and Houston of Texas, Borland of Arkansas.

On the 17th, it was taken up in the House, and ubjected to the same summary process under which the kindred measures from the Senate had been forced through; among many competitors for the floor, Mr. Brown of Mississippi, who stood leaning against his deak with the utmost composure, as if perfectly assured that he would obtain it, was recognised by the Speaker. He was ready with the following amendment:

"And be it further enacted, That if any free person or persons within the District of Co-lumbia shall entice or induce, by persuasion or other means, any slave or slaves to run away from his, her, or their owner or lawful possessor or shall in any manner aid, abet, assist any slave r slaves in running away, or escaping from the owner or lawful possessor of such slave or slaves, or shall harbor any slave or slaves with the intent to assist him, her, or them, to escape from the service of such owner or possessor, such per-son or persons shall be liable to indictment in the criminal court of the District of Columbia; and upon conviction, by verdict, confession, or otherwise, shall be imprisoned in the peniteniary for any time not exceeding five years."

Preston King expressed a desire to offer an mendment.

"The Speaker, (to Mr. Brown) Does the centleman from Mississippi yield the floor? "Mr. Brown. I do not yield. "IMr. King desired to move an ame

an additional section, proposing to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia.

"Mr. Brown said, that he had no intention to provoke again the discussion which had occupied so large a portion of the present session. He had had enough of that. He would merely sub-mit the amendment which he had sent to the Chair, and move to refer the bill to the Commit-tee on the District of Columbia; and on that motion he asked for the previous question.

"The previous question was seconded."

The previous question having been ordered,

he question was, first on the motion to refer, then on the amendment, finally on ordering the bill to a third reading. By this kind of management, all amendments but such as might be roposed by slaveholding members, were exluded. So much for having a Speaker identified with the slave interest.

"Mr. Preston King. I protest against this course, which denies to any one, except a friend of slavery, the opportunity to make a motion, or

ported. We hail it as one step, though a short propose an amendment, while these slavery bills "The Speaker rapped to order.
"Mr. King. I make that protest."

The question on referring was decided in the egative. The amendment of Mr. Brown was rejected by a vote of 108 to 68. The only members from the free States who voted for it was Mr. McClernand of Illinois. W. J. Brown of Indiana, whose name stands near the head of the roll of members, voted at first for the amendment. but after the roll had been completed, changed his vote. McClernand's name was not backing enough. No Southern man voted for the amendment. The usual motion to lay the bill on the table was made, and lost-yeas 53, nays 129 The bill was read a third time, and on its passage

the vote stood—yeas 124, nays 47—as follows: YEAS - Mesers. Albertson, Alexander, Andrews, Ashmun, Beale, Bingham, Bissell, Booth, Briggs, Brooks, W. J. Brown, Buel, Burrows, Chester Butler, T. B. Butler, Cable, Calvin Campbell, Carter, Casey, Chandler, Clark, Cleve land, Cole, Corwin, Crowell, Dickey, Dimmick Disney, Dixon, Doty, Duer, Duncan, Dunham Durkee, Eliot, Nathan Evans, Fitch, Fowler Freedley, Fuller, Gentry, Gerry, Gilbert, Gil-more, Gorman, Gott, Gould, Grinnell, Hall, Hall loway, Hampton, Harlan, T. L. Harris, Hay, Hay-mond, Hebard, Henry, Hibbard, Hongland, Howe, Hunter, W. T. Jackson, Julian, G. G. King, J. C. King, J. & King, Preston King, Leffler, Le-vin, Littlefield, Horace Mann, Job Mann, Mat-teson, McClernand, McDonald, McGaughey, Mc-Morris, Nelson, Ogle, Otis, Peaslee, Phœnix, Pit man, Potter, Putnam, Reed, Richardson, Ris Robbins, Robinson, Rose, Ross, Rumsey, Sackett, Sawtelle, Schenck, Schermerhorn, School-

craft, Silvester, Spaulding, Sprague, Thaddeus Stevens, Stetson, Strong, Taylor, James Thomp-son, Thurman, Tuck, Underhill, Vinton, Wal-den, Waldo, Wentworth, White, Whittlesey, den, Waldo, Wentworth, White, Whittiesey, Wildrick, Wood, and Young—124.

NAYS—Messrs. Alston, Anderson, Ashe, Averett, Bayly, Bowdon, Bowie, A. G. Brown, Burt, Cabell, G. A. Caldwell, J. P. Caldwell, Clingman, W. R.W. Cobb, Colcock, Deberry, Edmund-son, Alexander Evans, Ewing, Featherston, Green Hamilton, Haralson, I. G. Harris, S. W. Harris Hamilton, Haraison, I. G. Harris, S. W. Harris, Holladay, Howard, Hubbard, Inge, J. W. Jack-son, Andrew Johnson, Jones, Kaufman, Kerr, La Sere, Marshall, McDowell, R. M. McLane, Mc-Mullen, McQueen, Millson, Morse, Orr, Outlaw, Parker, Phelps, Powell, Savage, Seddon, F. P. Stanton, R. H. Stanton, A. H. Stephens, Thomas, Jacob Thompson, Venable, Wallace, Watkins Williams, and Woodward—47.

"[Mr. Stanly did not vote, having paired of with Mr. Holmes, who was against, while he was in favor of the bill.]
"So the bill passed."

The passage of the bill amidst a struggle in which the power of Congress to interfere in any way with the outshion of biavery is nating wenter by the South, is worthy of remark as involving practical affirmation of the opposite doctrine. It is an assertion by Congress of its power to regu late or abolish slavery wherever it exists within its jurisdiction.

HUNKERISM REJOICING.

Wilmot has been repudiated by the Democrat of a district in which he claimed to be invincible and is now running against the regular ticket Wentworth, of Illinois, sees breakers ahead, and has withdrawn from the field; and Bingham, o Michigan, is openly denounced by every Demo-cratic paper in his State, and does not dream of getting back to Congress. This is a fact more significant than any event of the last two years.

At a meeting of the Congressional Conferees of Bradford and Tioga counties, held at Towards. on the 5th instant, David Wilmot, a man of whom the Democracy should be proud, was regularly re-nominated for Congress. The delegates from Susquehana declined acting with those conferees and, uniting with two gentlemen from Tioga, appointed by a meeting called and sanctioned by only two out of nine members of the standing committee, put in nomination James Lowrey, who, according to the Pennsylvanian, is the regular Democratic nomince. The Convention which nominated Wilmot passed the following resolu-

"Resolved, That we acknowledge no test but principle in party politics; and, as Democrats, it firmly to maintain the Resolved, That we are unalterably opposed to the extension of human slavery into territory now free; and that we hold it to be the duty of Congress to prohibit by positive law its introduc-

tion therein.
"Resolved, That, standing upon these principles and relying with confidence upon the integrity of the Hon. David Wilmot faithfully to carry them out in our national councils, we presen him to the Democratic voters of this Congres

sional District as our candidate for Congress.

"Resolved, That the bold and unflinching man ted the preservation of free territory from the threatened encroachments of slavery, meets the admiration and approbation of the Democracy The Convention that nominated Lowrey adopt

" Resolved, That we acknowledge no test bu

ed the same resolutions in relation to slavery :

principle in party politics, and as Democrats it is our duty boldly to proclaim our principles, and Resolved, That we are unalterably opposed t the extension of slavery into territory now free, and that we hold it to be the duty of Congress

" Resolved, That standing upon these principles and relying with confidence upon the integrity of James Lowrey faithfully to carry them out in our National Councils, we present him to the Democratic voters of this Congressional District as our candidate for Congress. Recollect, that the Pennsylvanian and Washing

ton Union are rejoicing at the nomination of Mr

Lowrey, and then read the following anti-slavery

to prohibit by positive law its introduction

correspondence between Mr. Lowrey and his nominators: "Towanda, September 4, 1850. "Dear Sir: The late Democratic Convention of Susquehanna, from which we derived our appointment as conferees upon the subject of a nomination for Congress from this district, instructed us in terms 'to support no man for the office of Representative in Congress, who is not avowedly opposed to the further extension of slavery into

opposed to the further extension of slavery into territory now free."
"A very slight acquaintance, resulting from the fact that your residence is in a county somewhat remote from Susquebanna, and our anxiety to discharge what appears to us clear and plain duty, in the present crisis, leads us to ask at your hands an immediate response to the resolutions of our convention, in such terms as your honest opinions upon the subject may dictate.

Very respectfully, your obedient servants. "C. M. GERE, " Conferees from Susquehanna County " James Lowrey, Esq.

"Towanda, September 5, 1850. Gentlemen: Your note of vesterday, stating the instructions received by you from the late Democratic Convention of Susquehanna county, in regard to the selection of a candidate for Congress from this district, is this moment re-

"In reply, permit me candidly and briefly to say—that I concur entirely in the views expressed by your Convention in relation to the extension of slavery; and of those expressed in the resolu-tions passed by the late Democratic Convention of Tioga county. Should I, honored by your nom-ination, be so fortunate as to be elected by the Democracy of the district, I shall take pride and pleasure in faithfully sustaining, as far as my hum ble abilities will permit, the doctrines and meas ures to which your instructions refer; and also in promoting at all times the great principles and established usages of the party to which we in ommon belong

" To C. L. Brown, and C. M. Gere,

"I have the honor to be your obedient servant

Esqrs., Conferees."

Mr. Wilmot has been tried, and nobody doubts

his fidelity to Free Seil Principles, or his ability to maintain them. Mr. Lowrey is known abroad only by his hostility to Mr. Wilmot. In 1848, he was one of a dozen managers who ran Judge Brewster in opposition to Wilmot; and upon the Brewster banner, says the Tioga Banner, glowing colors stood out-the South has a right to transport her slaves to an equal share of the erritory acquired from Mexico." A pretty candidste for Anti-Slavery men, is Mr. Lowrey in 1850! We know something of the value of pledges in the eyes of Hunker Democrats in Penn-

Mr. Lowrey is not more solemnly pledged now

than were Messrs. Gilmore and Thompson in 1848; but the records of the present Congress show that all their pledges have been shamefully violated.

We presume Mr. Wentworth has not withdrawn from the field in fear of "the breakers" That the Cass politicians should denounce Bingham, is not surprising. He is a consistent, steadfast friend of Freedom; and his firmness and fidelity have made him any thing but acceptable to their pliable leader.

Stand by those who have stood by the cause of Free Soil in the present Congress, whatever their party denomination! Down with every man who has betrayed it! In every State, Hunkerism is untiring in its efforts to break down the men, but

for whom Freedom would have lost all in the struggle just closed. Where the intended victim is a Democrat, the Hunkers get up a candidate on their own account. aware that the Whigs of course will have their nominee, but preferring a Whig to a Free Soil triumph. Where a Free Soil Whig is to be sacrificed, Hunker Whigs pursue a similar policy We hope there will be virtue and sagacity enough among the People to baffle these base scho Men who have bravely defied Party for the sake of Principle should be sustained by all who look to Party as merely a means of securing the estab lishment of Principle.

RADICAL DEMOCRACY IN PADIANA Ex-Speaker Brown, who lately obtained the

ontrol of the Indiana State Sentinel, is doomed to a little more trouble than he anticipated in the honorable work of bringing back the Democracy of Indiana to their allegiance to the Slave Power Mr. Ellis, former editor of the Goshen Dem crat, now auditor of State, and Mr. Spann, late of the firm of Chapman and Spann, of the State Sentinel, have started a liberal Democratic journal, at Indianapolis, designed, we presume, to oppose the servile teachings of the Browns. Such a paper is greatly needed in Indiana. How the Demo cratic party in that State can tolerate as their leading editor, a man who, last winter in Congress disgraced himself, by an attempt to secure the Speaker's chair on the strength of written pledges to the Free-Soilers, and verbal pledges to the Slavery-Propagandists, we cannot understand

THE COMPROMISE BOUNDARY AND PEARCE'S BOUNDARY.

The New York Tribune, laboring to heap odium op the apponents of the Compromise bill of Clay, talks pathetically of the amount of territory which the Compromise bill concerning Texas would have secured, and what Pearce's bill yield-"Independent," the zealous Whig correspond-

ent of the Philadelphia North American, avows his preference for Pearce's bill to that of Mr. Clay on the following grounds: "First, because it secured nearly 6,000 square

miles more territory-1 mean available territo-ry-to New Mexico than the other; second, because the Southern starting point on the Rio Grande was twenty miles below that proposed by Mr. Clay; third, because it preserved to New Mexico four Spanish towns on the east side of the river; fourth, because it saved the eastern valleys of the Rio Grande to New Mexico, and did not sever the headwaters of Texan rivers and lastly, because it was a better and a more na ural boundary in every respect than that of the Compromise. These facts have been studiously concealed by those who talk of a surrender of 25,000 square miles of territory to Texas. It is erfectly true that Texas obtains more territory by Pearce's bill than by the other; but so does New Mexico also, and to the extent I have named. The territory acquired by Texas is a parchel desert, where neither slavery nor freedom speaking with reference to the distinction between n exist, if the most reliable informat

TUESDAY IN CONGRESS.

The House gave another expression of opinion last Tuesday, adverse to any alteration of the existing tariff.

Several bills containing grants of land, &c. were thereupon rejected. The Senate passed the Mexican Indemnity bill

from the House, and then proceeded to consider the bill granting permits in the gold mines of California.

UNJUST.

The London Anti-Slavery Reporter, commenting on the Lopez expedition to Cuba, remarks:

"The fact is, disguise it as we may, the Ameri-

would have hailed with satisfaction the capture of Cuba; and the authorities at Washington would have speedily acknowledged its independence of Spain, had a Provisional Government been formed. The South covets the Queen of the Antilles, because it would be a political counterpoise to the free States, which are rapidly coming into the Union; and because it would enable the older slave States to get rid, at a profitable market, of their redundant slave population, and prolong for an indefinite period, the system of slavery The North, commercially speaking, would be greatly benefited, and the produce and the market they so much prize would be all their own However great the stir at Washington, after the sailing of Lopez, and however great the energy displayed, since his return, we feel persuaded that General Taylor, at heart, as much regrets

the issue of the expedition as Lopez himself. This is unjust to the American People and to their Government. The great unjority of them did not sympathize with the piratical expedition of Lopez; and as to General Taylor's Administration, its action was prompt, energetic, efficient fully vindicating its honor and good faith. Our English friends must not yield to their prejudices so far as to imagine that the American People, with here and there an exception, are pirates.

THE CHAPLIN CASE.

The Republic furnishes the following intelligence respecting Mr. Chaplin: "A writ of habeas corpus was on Wednesday

issued by his honor Judge Cranch, Chief Justice of the Circuit Court for the District of Columbia, on the application of the counsel of this person, and he was yesterday morning brought before Judge C, who required bail in the amount of \$6,000 for his appearance at the fall term of the Criminal Court. The counsel retained by the Criminal Court. The counsel retained by the accused we understood to be J. H. Bradley, Daniel Ratcliffe, and Walter Jones, Esq's; but only Messers. Bradley and Ratcliffe appeared for him on this occasion. The United States was represented by the District Attorney, P. R. Fendall, Esq. Asa Childs, Esq, of the city of New York, who is understood to have come to Washington at the instance of certain friends of the prisoner was also present. A bond for the requisite amount of bail being entered into jointly and severally, by General Chaplin, David A. Hall, Selby Parker, and William Blanchard, the first named Parker, and William Blanchard, the first named was discharged from the custody of the jailor of Washington county, but held upon a warrant is-sued by virtue of the requisition of the Govern-or of Maryland, in compliance with which he was in the afternoon conveyed to Rockville by officers Goddard and Handy."

"As we stated yesterday, Mr. Chaplin was conveyed to Rockville on Thursday evening. Soon after his arrival there, he was taken before Squires Adamson, Spates, and Braddock. Here D. Ratcliffe, J. Brewer, and Asa Childs, Esq's, appeared in his defence; and the Hon. R. J. Bowie and J. H. Tuck, Esq's, for the prosecution. The number of persons assembled at the court-

appeared in his decided, so for the prosecution ie and J. H. Tuck, Esq's., for the prosecution. The number of persons assembled at the courthouse was unusually large.

"Mr. Bowie remarked that he had tendered his resignation of the office of Attorney for the Commonwealth, but that it had not been accepted and he felt it to be his duty to comply with the call made upon him to attend in the present case.

"Mr. Tuck stated that he was not a volunteer, but had been engaged by citizens of Montgomery to appear for the prosecution. He declaimed at some length upon the enormity of the offence attempted by the accused. In the midst of his speech he was vehemently applauded. Mr. Bowie rebuked this applause. Mr. Tuck expressed his regret for it. The magistrates commanded aflence, and ordered the arrest of any person offending in this wise. The applause was, however, subsequently repeated. We mention this as showing the excited feelings of the people.

"There was some argument between the counsel"

There was some argument between the courelative to the power of magistrates to accept for the prisoner's appearance, it being contended by the prosecution that a court of record alone was competent.